DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 647 AC 006 648

AUTHOR	Larson, Patricia; And Others
TITLE	Down the Up Staircase: A Study of New Careers Dropouts.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General College.
PUB DATE	Jun 69
NOTE	65p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.35
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Performance, *Adult Dropouts, Age Differences, *Dropout Characteristics, Educational Background, Family Status, Females, *Human Services, Investigations, Males, *Manpower Development, Marital Status, Participation, Race, Recruitment, Self Concept, Socioeconomic Status, *Subprofessionals, Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS	*New Careers Program, Self Concept Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

Using a sample of 105 persons who had left the Minneapolis New Careers Program (combined work and higher education), this study sought to predict who drops out of this type of program and to make recommendations for recruitment procedures. The Self-Concept Questionnaire and an inventory of work interests or needs were administered, but failed to show significant ability to predict who should or should not be recruited. A mobility scale was also administered. Younger men (in their twenties), separated or divorced persons, and nonwhites were more likely than their counterparts to drop out. Dropouts also tended to have fewer children, to be high school graduates, and to have been employed in unskilled jobs or unemployed before joining the program. Illness, family or legal problems, unmet needs in the work or educational situation, and problems of recruitment and placement were among the chief reasons expressed for dropping out. (The document includes 12 tables and an evaluation of the New Careers participants as students.) (LY)

AC006648

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED037647

DOWN THE UP STAIRCASE:

A STUDY OF NEW CAREERS DROPOUTS

BY

Patricia Larson, Mary Bible,

and R. Frank Falk

NEW CAREERS RESEARCH

General College and Minnesota Center
for Sociological Research
University of Minnesota

May, 1969

IMPORTANT

NOTE TO READER

The first section of this report is a summary of the substantive material from this study along with recommendations about recruitment and conclusions about who leaves the program. Secondly, the body of the report details the findings of this study and discusses methodology.

Readers should be advised that in the body a table summarizes the findings for each variable. A text on each variable (e.g., age, sex, previous occupation) follows each table for readers who are interested in all the details of the findings. Major points of the study are underlined in the body of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
NOTE TO READER.		i
LIST OF TABLES.		iii
Chapter		
I.	RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY	1
II.	INTRODUCTION.	10
III.	PROFILE OF THE ENROLLEES WHO LEFT NEW CAREERS (SEPT., 1967 - OCT., 1968).	13
IV.	DROP-OUT VERSUS STAY-IN ----- IS THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE?	16
V.	WHY DO NEW CAREERISTS LEAVE THE PROGRAM IN MINNEAPOLIS BEFORE COMPLETING TWO YEARS?.	43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
I.	AGE	21
II.	SEX	22
III.	MARITAL STATUS	23
IV.	NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY	25
V.	NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLDS OF ENROLLEES	26
VI.	EDUCATION COMPLETED	27
VII.	PREVIOUS OCCUPATION	28
VIII.	FATHER'S OCCUPATION	29
IX.	RACE	30
X.	POLITICAL ACTIVITY	31
XI.	MEAN SCORES ON SELF-CONCEPT SCALE	38
XII.	REASONS WHY ENROLLEES LEFT NEW CAREERS AS WAS STATED IN INTERVIEWS WITH THEM	45

DOWN THE UP STAIRCASE: A STUDY OF NEW CAREERS DROPOUTS[1,2]

CHAPTER I

Recommendations and Summary

Introduction

This study was conducted on a sample of 105 individuals who left the Minneapolis New Careers Program between September, 1967 and October, 1968. The intent of this study was to provide a prediction of who drops out of this type of program, and to make recommendations for recruitment procedures. For these purposes interviews and questionnaires were used by the research team.

The findings indicated that there were differences between drop-outs and stay-ins. However, these differences do not reduce down to what are called "simple effects." This is to say, there are a number of interactions between the various variables measured in noting differences between those who remain and those who leave the program. For example previous occupation is an important variable when combined with sex and race but not by itself. While these findings are discussed in the body of the report, it is important for the reader to understand that interactions produce a distinctive problem when one tries to make recommendations for recruitment procedures. In fact, it is impossible to find a single consistent variable which will account for who will leave and who will remain in the program.

---

[1]This research and report were funded under U.S. Department of Labor Contract #41-8-003-25.

[2]This report may not be published either in whole or in part without prior written permission from the New Careers Research.

In addition to the ten variables discussed in the report, two standardized instruments--the MIQ and Self-Concept Inventory--were used by the research team. The MIQ is a standard questionnaire used to help identify the work interests or needs of people given the questionnaire. The Self-Concept Inventory relates to the qualities a person attributes to himself in a particular role. These two instruments failed to show any predictive power which is adequate for choosing who should and who should not be recruited into a new careers program. This finding prohibits the use of these instruments for administrative selection into the program, in spite of the fact that they are well developed instruments.

However, other information does provide a basis upon which a recommendation can be made regarding the method by which persons can be selected into the program so as to reduce the number of drop outs.

Recommendations Concerning Recruitment and Placement

This study indicates there is a need for broad recruitment followed by an intensive orientation program where people may select themselves in or out of the program after two weeks. This may seem costly, but when one considers the high drop-out rate in Minneapolis, this kind of orientation could possibly alleviate some of the problems.

For example, one of the problems was that when people were recruited into New Careers they often were not given an accurate picture of what New Careers is about in Minneapolis. It seems best not to rely on individual recruiters and neighborhood agencies to get all the necessary information distributed, but to hold orientation sessions for recruits before they are permanently assigned to an agency.

In such orientation sessions aides could get their questions answered about training on the job, general education, responsibility on the job, the wage scale and other areas of concern for them. At the same time supervisors from the specific agencies could outline what the responsibilities of enrollees would be in their agencies. Then potential aides might spend two to three days at one or more of the agencies they are interested in working at.

At the end of this period the potential aides could meet with the supervisors of the agency they want to work for and with people from the Central Administration and get a permanent assignment, or decide to leave the program. This would help make the final assignment to an agency a two-way endeavor rather than just having the Central Administration put the applicant into a job slot.

Potential aides would be paid during the orientation sessions. Hopefully this kind of orientation--which would take a lot of coordination and initial recruitment of potential aides--would help solve some of the problems centering around recruitment and placement which caused many people to leave New Careers in Minneapolis during the first year.

Specifically, this recommendation suggests that the following procedure be instituted for the recruitment and selection of new careers enrollees. First, it is very important to recruit on a very wide basis. All community agencies should be informed of the fact that a New Careers program is being instituted and that recruitment is based on certain federal standards, which should be listed. Additionally, notification of the development of this program should be released to the public media. This first release of information should include some specifics

as to the nature of the program, the requirements for admission and the activities in which enrollees would be involved.

Once recruitment has begun, local administrators should screen the applicants to insure that only those persons who qualify according to federal guidelines proceed. From the beginning it is important to point out to all applicants that the number of slots actually available will be smaller than the number of applicants.

All applicants who meet the requirements of federal standards should then be brought into a two week orientation program. It is very important that those persons who have jobs be told not to quit their jobs at this time. As a result it may be necessary for the program to run one orientation session at night for these persons.

The orientation session should be a paid two week period during which time all aspects of the program are to be completely explained to the applicants. Under no circumstances are future plans to be discussed. Only those items of the program which are in fact established should be discussed. In this light, it should be clearly understood by all administrators that plans are treated as promises by low income persons. Discussion of future plans tends to cloud the relevant issues and to cause disillusionment later in the program.

As a result of the orientation program a large number of individuals will find the program unsuited for their needs. Others will find the program too demanding. Men with large families should become alert to the possible reduction in income which will mean that they can not participate. This then is the process of self selection. This process most likely will guarantee the highest rate of successful retention in

the program. If the number of applicants still exceeds the number of slots available, two procedures can then be used for further reductions. (It is strongly suggested from our data that this will not be the case.) The first procedure is to allow user agencies to conduct interviews with those persons applying, to determine which of the applicants is most acceptable to them. If this does not produce the needed reduction, then the administrators may use the variables presented in the body of this report as possible criteria.

However, even if new procedures for recruitment and placement are set up, New Careers means little more than a two-year job-training program for more low-level dead-end jobs if agencies, professionals and the Central Administration involved with New Careers do not see this program as a real investment to find new ways to use valuable human resources. If this is not meant to be a long-term investment, then New Careers just becomes another small band-aide to temporarily cover the wounds of poverty in this country for a little longer, and in the end people are only more disillusioned in the patchwork attempts by the system to change things.

Summary

Who Drops Out?

The profile of drop-outs indicates that a person with any <u>one</u> of the following characteristics is more likely to leave the program. Men are more likely to leave than women. A younger person in his twenties is more likely to leave than a person in his thirties or forties. Persons who are separated or divorced and non-whites are more likely to leave than their counterparts. Drop-outs also tended to: have fewer

children, be high school graduates, and have been unemployed or employed in unskilled jobs prior to entering the program. However, it is not all that easy in noting these significant differences between the drop-out group of 105 and the stay-in group of 155 to predict who will stay in and who will leave the program.

In looking at the differences between the two groups, statistical information was compiled on ten variables and three scales. In this study these variables and scales are controlled according to sex, previous occupation, and race. In most cases sex is the significant control. The ten variables examined include: age, sex, marital status, number of children, number of people in the household, education completed, previous occupation, father's occupation, race, and political activity. Each variable is discussed separately in the main body of this report. The scales used include the Self-Concept Inventory, a mobility scale, and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, all of which are discussed separately in the main body of this report.

When the total sample is grouped according to sex there is a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins on seven variables. There is a significant difference between the number of men and women who drop out and stay in the program. Slightly over 50% of the men left the New Careers Program during the first year while only 33% of the women left the program during the first year. For women there is a significant difference between the stay-ins and drop-outs on the variables of age, marital status, number of children, and education completed. For men there is a significant difference between the stay-ins and drop-outs on the variables of age, marital status, and previous

occupation. The total group of men and women drop-outs have fewer children on the average than the men and women remaining in the program.

The significant factors, when sex is a control, are: Older women, who have less education than other sub-groups, and who have larger families to support alone, or help support, tend to stay in the program. The total group of women remaining in the program is 100. Race is not a significant factor with this group of women. For men, drop-outs tend to have had previous jobs in Category Three, which means they probably worked at unskilled jobs or were unemployed prior to entering New Careers.

Previous occupation as a control shows that a higher percentage of men who leave the program had low-level jobs before entering New Careers. Otherwise there is only a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins when grouped according to previous occupation on the variables of age and sex.

When the total sample is grouped according to race there is a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins on six variables. However in many cases the large group of white women who stayed in the program influenced this factor. This is seen in the fact that a higher percentage of non-white women leave the program compared to white women leaving the program, and a higher percentage of non-white men stay in the program, compared to white men leaving the program. Other variables where there is a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins when grouped according to race include: age, marital status, number of children, number of people in the household, and previous occupation. Both non-white and white stay-ins are older on the average than their counterparts who drop out. A higher percentage of non-whites remaining

in the program are separated, divorced or widowed. Whites remaining in the program have significantly more children than whites who drop out, and also more people in their households. A higher percentage of non-whites who left the program had previous jobs in Category Three (unskilled jobs or unemployed). With all these variables the influencing factor is still sex even when the total group is broken down according to race.

There is no way to predict by studying the significant differences between the drop-out group and stay-in group what kind of people should be recruited into the program. There is no single profile for the drop-out group. People who leave the program have many different characteristics. One can only say that at this time older women with large families tend to stay with the program, while men with low-level job skills tend to leave the program as it is presently set up. Consequently looking at why people leave the New Careers Program may give a better indication of what can be done to meet the needs of more of the people who enter the program.

Why They Drop Out?

Forty-five out of 105 drop-outs were interviewed by the research team to find out why they left the program. Information on the rest of the drop-out group was obtained from the Central Office and the families of enrollees when they were not available for personal interviews.

The main reasons why enrollees left the program include: personal reasons such as illness, family problems, problems with the law; needs of the enrollee not being met in work or education situation, such as dislike for the kind of work assigned and irrelevant course requirements;

and problems of recruitment and placement. With the last two categories, some changes could be made in the administration of the program in order to help alleviate some of the problems New Careerists faced. The orientation session mentioned at the first of this report is one example of such changes needed.

CHAPTER II

Introduction

In many job training programs financed by the Federal Government, large numbers of people leave the program before they finish their training. In the Minneapolis, Minnesota New Careers Program, the research team attempted to study this group of people. It was difficult to get information from all the people who left the program, and thus there are some gaps in the conclusions reached in this report. Part of the difficulty was due to the problem of locating people once they left the New Careers Program.

This report looks at the group of 105 people who left Minneapolis New Careers between September, 1967, and October 30, 1968, and tries to find answers to the following questions:

1) Who is a drop-out--a descriptive profile?

2) Is there any significant difference between the group of people who left the program and those who remained in the program?

3) Were there problems with recruitment and placement or did people leave for other reasons?

4) Did the agencies attempt to meet the needs of the New Careerists who dropped out; or did the group that remained in the program make more adjustments to their work situation than did those who dropped out?

5) Do the enrollees that drop out show any significant changes while they are in the program?

Each section of this report deals with one of the above questions in trying to find out why some people left the New Careers Program and

what, if anything, makes them different from the people who stay in the program.

Sources of Data

In studying this problem several different sources of information were used. First, a standard questionnaire was given to all the New Careerists when they first entered the program. This same questionnaire was used for repeated measures at six month intervals. These questionnaires were used to investigate demographic information, occupational history and aspirations, education, mobility and self-concept.

Secondly, the research team contacted as many drop-outs as possible for personal interviews. These personal interviews dealt with such things as why a person chose to leave the program, what his idea of the New Careers concept was, and his plans after leaving New Careers.

Three supplemental sources of data were used from the Work Adjustment Project. These included the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and the Supervisor Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ). The MIQ is used to help identify the work interests or needs of the people given the questionnaire. The MSQ attempts to evaluate how satisfied a person is with his work situation. Both these questionnaires were given to all the New Careerists in September, 1967 or July, 1968. The SEQ was given to all the supervisors who worked directly with a New Careerist and gave supervisors the opportunity to evaluate the job performance of aides in their user agency. From these only the MIQ was a valuable source of information for the drop-out group because too small a group of drop-outs took the

MSQ and SEQ.[1]

Problems with the Data Gathered

Trying to get information from all the people who left New Careers was very difficult. This difficulty shows up in the data. For example, for 74 out of 105 drop-outs demographic information is available in the completed questionnaires. For 26 former enrollees only a limited amount of demographic information could be compiled from their application forms. For five drop-outs there is virtually no demographic information. This means that on many of the scales, such as mobility and self conception, there are a maximum of 74 responses out of a total sample of 105.

---

[1]For further information on this data see: Margaret A. Thompson, R. Frank Falk, Job Interests and Job Satisfactions of New Careerists (New Careers Research, General College and Minnesota Center for Sociological Research), January, 1969.

CHAPTER III

PROFILE OF THE ENROLLEES WHO LEFT NEW CAREERS (SEPT., 1967 - OCT., 1968)

Summary: The profile of drop-outs indicates that a person with any one of the following characteristics is more likely to leave the program. Men are more likely to leave than women. A younger person in his twenties is more likely to leave than a person in his thirties or forties. Persons who are separated or divorced and non-whites are more likely to leave than their counterparts. Drop-outs also tended to: have fewer children, be high school graduates, and have been unemployed or employed in unskilled jobs prior to entering the program.

Break-down of Drop-Out Profile

In the group of 105 people who left New Careers about 50% were men. With data on sex for 102 aides, 49 were women and 53 were men.

The average age for 100 drop-outs was 31.5 years. This breaks down to be 45 people in their 20's; 38 people in their thirties; 15 people in their 40's; and two people in their 50's.

Over 50 per cent of the drop-out group (99 responses) indicated they had been married at one time and were separated from their spouses when they entered New Careers. There were 21 single people who left the program, and 27 married people. The group separated from their spouses consisted of 15 people separated; 28 people divorced; and 8 people widowed.

The average number of children for 76 drop-outs was 2.63. Sixty-four people in this group had 0-4 children; and twelve people had 5-8

children.

The average number of people in a household for 64 drop-outs was 3.71 people. In 53 out of 64 households there were 5 people or less. In 11 households there were 6-9 people.

With 79 responses concerning race, over 50% out of 79 were non-white. The frequency breakdown indicated 48 non-white and 31 white.

The average number of grades in school completed by 98 drop-outs fell between 11th grade and graduation from high school. Only four people left school before entering the ninth grade. Twenty-eight in this group attended some high school but did not graduate. Forty-two people had completed high school. Twenty-one people attended one to three years of college, and three people finished four years of college before entering New Careers.

However 48 out of 76 people who left New Careers during the first year indicated they worked as unskilled laborers, day laborers, or were unemployed or on welfare before entering the program. Only 28 people in this group listed skilled labor or office work as a previous occupation. This group included such jobs as cook, machinist, secretaries and other clerical jobs, and salesmen or other jobs with some independence. There were no people in this group who had previous jobs in the learned (doctors, executives, or military personnel) or highly skilled (teachers, company owners, etc.) professions.

For 53 drop-outs there was information on what their father's occupation was. This included eight former enrollees whose father's were farmers. Fifteen drop-outs had fathers who worked as unskilled laborers, day laborers or were unemployed. The fathers of 27 people in this group

were skilled workers with 12 of the 27 in skilled professions such as technicians, accountants or in some low-level supervisory capacity. Only three former New Careerists had fathers who worked in the highly skilled professions (teacher, or low-prestige ministry). This may indicate that the fathers of some drop-outs had higher status jobs than their children.

The mobility scales included such items on the standard questionnaire as: "I would like to be given more responsibility in my position as an aide." In four items indicating upward mobility, 70 per cent out of a group of 70 enrollees who left the program indicated some type of upward mobility aspirations. In this case, mobility is defined in terms of the education and job situation--"a better job," "more responsibility on the job," "getting a college degree," "going back to what I was doing before." Less than 4% responded to the mobility scales in a way that would indicate downwardly mobile aspirations.

Another aspect of mobility that the research team attempted to measure included political mobility--meaning a person's involvement in the politics of his community. One of the questions used to measure this was "Have you ever worked for a candidate?". About 87% out of a group of 72 drop-outs indicated they had. This indicates that 63 out of 72 had probably been involved in some kind of electoral politics before joining New Careers. There is no information on this group to indicate whether such activity increased or decreased after they were in New Careers. But the fact that 1968 was an election year may have had some influence on the number of people indicating they had worked for a candidate.

CHAPTER IV

DROP-OUT VERSUS STAY-IN ----- IS THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE?

Summary: The most significant differences between drop-outs and stay-ins are influenced by the 100 women who remained in the New Careers Program after October 31, 1968. This group of women is older on the average than the group of owmen drop-outs or either group of men. These women, remaining in the program, on the average, have more people in their households. A large percentage (68%) of these women are the head of the household. Consequently it seems that the group most likely to stay in New Careers in Minneapolis are older women with families to support.

These women are probably looking more for steady employment rather than a chance to move up either occupationally or educationally. Also their self concept is higher on the average than any other large sub-group which may indicate they are more of what they want from New Careers. This group would take the chance to move up if it is there, but would not drop out in large numbers if they cannot advance as fast as some might hope to under this program.

On the other hand men are more apt to leave the program as it is set up presently than any other sub-group. Slightly over 50% of the men enrolled in New Careers left the program within the first year.

In neither the group of women who stayed in nor the group of men who dropped out is race an extremely significant factor. A slightly higher percentage of white men leave the program than non-white men, and a slightly higher percentage of non-white women leave than white women

(significant for both men and women at the p $<.20>.10$ level).

The other variables used to compare the two groups do not point up any more striking differences than the break-down by sex does. It is the group of 100 women who stay in the program that influences most of the significant differences between the drop-outs and the stay-ins.

Definitions of Variables Used to Compare Drop-Out and Stay-In Groups

Ten variables and three scales are used to compare the two groups. These two groups are: 1) the drop-out group, people who entered the program between August, 1967 and July, 1968 but left it before October 31, 1968; and 2) the stay-in group, people who entered the program between August, 1967 and July, 1968 and were still with the program as of November 1, 1968.

The following variables are examined in this section: age, sex, marital status, number of children--whether they are living with the person or not--number of people in the household, education completed, previous occupation, father's occupation, race, and political activity.

Race

Race is divided into "non-white" and "white" groupings in this report. The following question was asked in the standard questionnaire given to 228 out of 260 people in the total sample for this report:

> "To which of the following groups do you trace your personal origins?"
>
> a. American-Indian
> b. American-Negro
> c. Americans from Latin America (for example, Mexico, Brazil)
> d. Americans from Northern Europe (for example, Germany, Sweden)
> e. Americans from Southern Europe (for example, Italy and Spain)
> f. Americans from Eastern Europe (for example, Poland and Hungary)
> g. Americans from Asia (for example, Phillipines and Japan)

Items a, b, c, and g, and combinations of these groups with d, e, and f are classified as "non-white." Items d, e, and f are classified as "white."

Occupation

The North-Hatt Scale for ranking occupations was used with modifications according to some specific problems that arose with this sample. The North Hatt Scale gives occupations a status ranking from 1 to 7 (1 being the highest). Ranking on this scale, in its original form, is done purely according to status (not wealth, power, or class though there may be some relationship to each of these). A list of occupations was rated by a carefully stratified sample of the general United States' population according to the prestige of each occupation. This means of ranking leads to inherent inconsistencies as well as difficulties peculiar to the sample of New Careerists. For example on the North-Hatt scale, a high school principal and a high school teacher may both have the same ranking. Thus the chief problem with the scale itself is internal consistency. With the sample of New Careerists the problems of using this scale are greatly increased. First a large number--perhaps one-third--one of the occupations mentioned by respondents are not listed on the scale. In these cases the research team had to employ its own judgment in assigning a ranking to many of the occupations listed by New Careerists.

Another problem is that the nature of the occupations familiar to the respondents differs somewhat from the population which was tested around 1960 for the North-Hatt Scale. For example, "aide" was a nearly non-existent occupation at that time, and is still perhaps unfamiliar

to many people, while it is an every day term with great meaning for people in this sample. The research team arbitrarily assigned the rank of "5" to an "aide" response, but this raises other problems. For example, there are Police Aides in the Minneapolis New Careers Program, and aides were asked aspirational questions about occupation in the standard questionnaire. With this scale a Police Aide who "aspired" to become a Police Officer would not change his status ranking ("5") if he did become an officer. Also, by entering the program, a person may actually have given up an occupation with a higher rank, such as car salesman. Furthermore, many aides in the sample aspire to become Social Workers, who have a "3" rating for the general population and yet may be the prime figure of class, authority, and status for many low-income people, whose futures and livelihood are often determined by Social Workers. Thus the scale is not a good index for measuring aspiration in this group of New Careerists although it is the best index available without additional large scale research which the Research Project for New Careers could not undertake.

In this report the North-Hatt Scale of 1 to 7 is collapsed down to three categories. The following list summarizes the occupations listed in each of the seven North-Hatt intervals and shows how these seven were collapsed into the three categories used in this study: 1) learned professional occupations, 2) skilled profession and trade occupations, and 3) semi-skilled and unskilled occupations.

Learned Professional Occupations (1):

1. Learned Professions -- e.g., medicine, top-flight corporation executives and military personnel, creative occupations, ministry, stockbrokers, large farm owners.

2. Highly Skilled Professionals -- e.g., corporation scientists, middle-management executives, company owners, low-prestige ministry, military officers, high school teachers.

Skilled Profession and Trade Occupations (2):

3. Skilled professionals -- e.g., experts, technicians, accountants, photographers, retail store merchants of medium sized concerns, insurance salesmen, representatives plant or city superintendents (i.e., clerical workers with some supervisory capacities, executive secretaries), average midwest farmer.

4. Most Clerical and Secretarial occupations (lowest white collar) -- e.g., secretaries, highly skilled tradesmen factory foremen, machinist, tailor, printer, employed photographer, cabinet maker, small store owners, pharmacists, average salesman - wholesale items.

5. Any Skilled Workman -- e.g., mechanic, repairman, cook, painter, plumber.
City Service -- e.g., policeman, fireman, milkman, mailman, bus driver.
Low Clerical -- e.g., order filler, dime store, movie clerk or cashier.
One-man store, repair shop.

Semi-Skilled and Unskilled Occupations (3):

6. Semi-Skilled manual labor -- e.g., assembly line work, maintenance work for the City, meter reader, truck driver, taxi-drivers, chauffeur, waiter, waitresses.

7. Menial Work -- e.g., janitor, garbage disposal.
Hard Labor -- e.g., construction, railroad labor, miners.
Domestics, babysitters (full-time), farm labor.
Unemployed or disabled.

In most cases Categories Two and Three are used in this report as only one or two people had previous occupations that were in Category One.

Political Activity

This is examined in terms of the question: "Have you ever worked for a candidate?" Seventy-four drop-outs and 149 stay-ins responded to this question.

The three scales which are also part of this group of variables

will be discussed in a later section. The following paragraphs discuss the differences between the group that left the program and the group that remained in the program in terms of the variables defined above.

Break-down of Differences Between Drop-Outs and Stay-Ins on Ten Variables

Age

TABLE I: AGE

Age As Broken Down By:	Stay-in Score (mean age)	Drop-out Score (mean age)	p[1]
Sex: Men	x = 31.5	x = 30.3	p <.25 >.10
Sex: Women	x = 37.2	x = 32.8	p <.005 >.001
Occupation: Level 2	x = 36.5	x = 30.0	p <.001
Occupation: Level 3	--	--	not sig.
Race: White	x = 38.7	x = 32.0	p <.001
Race: Non-White	x = 33.4	x = 31.7	p <.25 >.10
Total	$\bar{x}$ = 35.5	$\bar{x}$ = 31.5	p <.001

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

When the variable of age is compared between 100 enrollees who left and the 152 enrollees who stayed with New Careers, there is a significant difference between the average ages of the two groups. The drop-out group is younger than the group that remained with the program. (See Table I.)

The average ages of the men who leave the program and men who

stay in are quite similar while there is a significant difference between the two groups of women. The average age for male drop-outs is 30.3, while for males staying in New Careers it is 31.5 years. The women who drop out are significantly younger ($\bar{x}$ = 32.8) than the women who remained in the program ($\bar{x}$ = 37.2 years).

There is a significant age difference between the whites who drop out and stay in but not between the non-whites who drop out and stay in. The whites leaving the program are younger than those remaining with New Careers. The average age for non-whites who left the program is 31.7 years while that for non-whites remaining with the program is 33.4.

There is also a significant age difference between the drop-out group and stay-in group whose previous occupations were in Category Two (middle-level). Younger aides who had previous jobs at this level drop out before older aides with previous jobs at this level.

In looking at the ages of the two groups in the sample, older white women, who may be trying to support their families alone, stay with New Careers more than other age groups.

Sex

TABLE II: SEX

Sex as Broken Down By:	Stay-ins - # in Sub-groups		Drop-outs - # in Sub-groups		p[1]
	M	F	M	F	
Occupation Category 2	20	36	11	17	not sig.
Occupation Category 3	21	24	33	15	$p < .10 > .05$
Race White	11	42	17	14	$p < .01 > .001$
Race Non-White	32	37	24	24	not sig.
Totals	52	100	53	49	$p < .01 > .001$

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

When the variable of sex is looked at for a group of 102 people who left the program and 152 people still in the program after November, 1968, there is a significant difference between the distribution of men and women who drop out and stay in (Table II). Fifty per cent of the men left the program while only thirty-three per cent of the women left the program.

When this group is broken down by race, there is a significant difference between the distribution of the white men and women who stay in and drop out. Fifty-five per cent of the white drop-outs are men while 45% of the white drop-outs are women.

There is also a significant difference in the distribution of men and women who drop out and stay in who had previous occupations in Category Three ($p < .10 > .05$). Sixty-nine per cent of the people who had previous jobs in Category Three and leave the program are men while only 47 % of the stay-ins with previous jobs in this category are men.

Marital Status

TABLE III: MARITAL STATUS

Marital Status as Broken Down by:	Stay-ins[1] 1	2	3	4	5	Drop-outs[2] 1	2	3	4	5	p[3]
Sex: Men	11	24	11	2	0	15	22	4	11	0	$p < .05 > .02$
Sex: Women	9	22	18	44	5	6	5	11	17	8	$p < .10 > .05$
Occupation: Category 2	7	18	10	16	4	6	6	4	10	1	not sig.
Occupation: Category 3	11	13	10	11	0	12	15	5	10	4	$p < .30 > .20$
Race: White	5	19	6	18	4	5	9	3	9	4	not sig.
Race: Non-White	14	18	16	20	1	13	12	6	13	4	$p < .02 > .01$
Total	20	46	29	47	5	21	27	15	28	8	$p < .30 > .20$

[1] 1 = Single, 2 = Married, 3 = Separated, 4 = Divorced, 5 = Widowed.
[2] Same as 1 above.
[3] Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

There is only a significant difference in the frequency distribution on marital status when single and divorced groups are compared.

There is a significant difference on the distribution of marital status for men who drop and stay in ($p < .05 > .02$). Fifty per cent of the males in the program are married while only 42% of the men who leave the program are married. Twenty-seven per cent of the men remaining in the program are separated or divorced while 29% of the male drop-outs are in this category.

There is also a significant difference of the distribution of marital status for women who drop-out and stay-in ($p < .10 > .05$). Twenty-two per cent of the women remaining in the program are married while only 11% of the women who leave the program are married. Sixty-eight per cent of the women remaining in the program are divorced or separated while 77 per cent of the women dropping out of New Careers are separated or divorced.

When stay-ins and drop-outs are grouped according to race concerning marital status, there is a significant difference between the distribution of non-white stay-ins and drop-outs ($p < .02 > .01$). Twenty-six per cent of the non-whites remaining in the program are married while 25% of the non-whites who drop out are married. Fifty-four per cent of the non-whites in the program are separated, divorced, or widowed while only 48% of the non-white drop-outs were in this category (Table III).

Number of Children

TABLE IV: NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY

Number of Children Broken Down By:	Stay-ins - # in Sub-groups (mean)	Drop-outs - # in Sub-groups	p[1]
Sex: Men	x = 2.0	x = 2.3	not sig.
Sex: Women	x = 3.6	x = 3.2	$p < .25 > .10$
Occupation: Category 2	--	--	not sig.
Occupation: Category 3	--	--	not sig.
Race: White	x = 3.7	x = 2.6	$p < .025 > .010$
Race: Non-White	x = 2.8	x = 2.6	$p < .40 > .25$
Total	x = 3.2	x = 2.6	$p < .10 > .05$

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

When 76 drop-outs and 118 stay-ins are compared on this variable, there is a significant difference between the average number of children for each group ($p < .10 > .05$). This group of drop-outs has fewer children ($\bar{x} = 2.6$) than the group that stayed in the program ($\bar{x} = 3.2$).

Men as a total group in New Careers have fewer children than women in New Careers, but there is no significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins when grouped according to sex. Whites who stay in New Careers have significantly more children (x = 3.7) than whites who drop out (x = 2.6), (Table IV).

Number of People in the Household

TABLE V: NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLDS OF ENROLLEES

Number of People in Household broken down by:	Stay-ins - # in Sub-groups (mean)	Drop-outs - # in Sub-groups (mean)	p[1]
Sex: Men	x = 3.8	x = 3.0	p<.05>.02
Sex: Women	x = 4.4	x = 4.3	not sig.
Occupation: Category 2	x = 4.0	x = 4.0	not sig.
Occupation: Category 3	x = 3.8	x = 3.3	p<.25>.10
Race: White	x = 4.4	x = 3.5	p<.05>.025
Race: Non-White	x = 3.8	x = 3.8	not sig.
Total	x = 4.2	x = 3.7	p<.025>.05

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

Sixty-four drop-outs and 139 stay-ins responded to a question concerning this variable. When the two groups are compared there is a significant difference between them on this variable. People in this sample who remained in the program have a greater number of people in their households (x = 4.2) than people who leave the program (x = 3.7). Men who remained in the program had significantly more people in their households than men who left the program. Whites who stayed in the program also have significantly larger households than whites who left the program. Again this variable seems to indicate that it is probably the older white women with larger families that are staying with New Careers, (Table V).

Education

TABLE VI: EDUCATION COMPLETED

Education Completed Broken Down By:	Stay-ins - mean grade completed	Drop-outs - mean grade completed	p[1]
Men	x = 4.7 (11th gr. +)	x = 4.9	not sig.
Sex Women	x = 4.5	x = 4.8	p<.10>.05
Category 2	x = 4.8	x = 5.1	p<.25>.10
Occupation Category 3	x = 4.6	x = 4.6	not sig.
White	x = 4.6	x = 4.6	not sig.
Race Non-White	x = 4.6	x = 4.8	p<.25>.10
Total	x = 4.6	x = 4.9	p<.10>.05

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

On this variable the drop-out group contains 98 respondents, and the stay-in group contains 150 respondents. There is a significant difference between the amount of education completed when the two groups are compared. People who stayed in New Careers after November, 1968, have more formal schooling than people who left the program. Women who stayed in New Careers have significantly ($p<.10>.05$) less education ($x = 4.5$) than women who left the program ($x = 4.8$). On the average women who stayed in New Careers had completed the least amount of education of any of the sub-groups in the total group.

Previous Occupation

TABLE VII: PREVIOUS OCCUPATION

Previous Occupation Broken Down By:	Stay-ins - # in Category 1,2,3			Drop-outs - # in Category 1,2,3			p^1
	1	2	3	1	2	3	
Men	1	20	21	0	11	33	$p < .05 > .02$
Sex Women	0	36	24	0	17	15	not sig.
White	1	24	16	0	8	17	$p < .10 > .05$
Race Non-White	0	32	27	0	16	27	$p < .20 > .10$
Total	1	56	45	0	28	48	$p < .05 > .02$

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

There is a significant difference between 76 people in the drop-out group and 102 people in the stay-in group in the frequency distribution of previous occupations. Only 37% of the drop-out group had previous occupations in Category Two, while 55% of the stay-in group had previous occupations in Category Two. Twenty per cent more drop-outs had previous jobs in Category Three than those who stayed in the program. Seventy-five per cent of the men who left the program had previous jobs in Category Three. This is the highest percentage for any of the sub-groups which probably indicates that men with fewer "job skills" are more apt to leave New Careers before completing the program than any other occupational grouping.

There is also a significant difference in the distribution between non-whites and whites when grouped according to occupational level. A

higher percentage of non-white drop-outs had previous jobs in Category Three than those non-whites who stayed in the program. Also, a higher percentage of white drop-outs had previous jobs in Category Three than whites who stayed in the program.

Consequently it seems that only sex is a significant control when looking at previous occupation level and men, regardless of race, who had previous jobs in Category Three tend to drop out more frequently than any other sub-group when previous occupation is examined (Table VII).

Father's Occupation

TABLE VIII: FATHER'S OCCUPATION

Father's Occupation Broken Down By:		Stay-ins - # in Category 1,2,3			Drop-outs - # in Category 1,2,3			p^1
		1	2	3	1	2	3	
Sex	Men	1	20	17	1	14	7	not sig.
	Women	1	44	25	2	13	8	$p < .30 > .20$
Previous Occupation	Category 2	1	28	21	1	13	8	not sig.
	Category 3	1	20	20	2	11	3	$p < .10 > .05$
Race	White	1	36	13	1	12	4	not sig.
	Non-White	2	28	28	1	15	11	not sig.
Total		3	64	43	3	27	15	not sig.

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

This variable is examined for 107 stay-ins and 42 drop-outs. Only at one level is there a significant difference in the distribution between

the drop-outs and stay-ins. In the sub-group of people with previous occupations in Category Three, the distribution between drop-outs and stay-ins is significantly different. Sixty-nine per cent of the drop-outs who had previous jobs in Category Three had fathers who had jobs in Category Two while 50% of the stay-ins in this sub-group had fathers with jobs in Category Two (Table VIII).

Race

TABLE IX: RACE

Race Broken Down By:	Stay-ins - # in 2 Sub-groups		Drop-outs - # in 2 Sub-groups		p^1
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White	
Sex: Men	11	32	17	24	$p < .20 > .10$
Sex: Women	42	37	14	24	$p < .20 > .10$
Previous Occupation: Category 2	24	32	8	16	not sig.
Previous Occupation: Category 3	16	27	17	27	not sig.
Total	53	70	31	48	not sig.

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

When 123 stay-ins and 79 drop-outs are compared by race there is no significant difference between the distribution of the two groups, but when men stay-ins and drop-outs are compared there is some indication of a significant difference in the distribution. Fifty-nine per cent of the male drop-outs are non-white while 74% of the men staying in the program are non-white. Thus there is a higher percentage of non-white men who stay in the program than who leave. Fourteen per

cent more non-white women left the program than non-white women staying in the program (Table IX).

Political Activity

TABLE X: POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Political Activity Broken Down By:	Stay-ins - # in 2 Sub-groups		Drop-outs - # in 2 Sub-groups		p^2
	Yes	No[1]	Yes	No	
Men	39	13	28	4	$p < .30 > .20$
Sex Women	74	23	35	5	$p < .30 > .20$
Category 2	41	14	16	7	not sig.
Previous Occupation Category 3	33	12	22	1	$p < .10 > .05$
White	39	14	13	5	not sig.
Race Non-White	52	16	34	4	$p < .20 > .10$

[1]These responses are in answer to the question: "Have you ever worked for a political candidate?"

[2]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding differences could have occurred by chance alone.

There is a significant difference in the frequency distribution of the group of 149 stay-ins and the group of 72 stay-ins when they were asked the question: "Have you ever worked for a political candidate?" A lower percentage of the drop-outs (12½%) had not worked for a political candidate than the group of stay-ins, where 24% had not worked for a political candidate.

A significant difference exists between the group of stay-ins and drop-outs on this variable who had previous jobs in Category Three. A

higher percentage of drop-outs in this group had worked for a political candidate (86%) than the group of stay-ins in this sub-group (73%). There is also a tendency toward a significant difference on this variable in the distribution of non-white stay-ins and drop-outs. A higher percentage of the non-white drop-outs had worked for a political candidate (89%) than the group of non-white stay-ins, where only 76% had worked for a political candidate. Only 60% of the white drop-out group had worked for a political candidate (Table X).

Scales Concerning Mobility, Self-Concept and Self-Esteem

Several scales were included in the standard questionnaire that 230 people out of the total sample of 260 took at some point during the time they were in New Careers. These scales were used to attempt to find out how people view themselves concerning certain characteristics. The details of setting up these scales are not discussed here because this report is concerned more with finding out if any significant differences exist between the drop-out and stay-in groups on these scales.

Mobility

Six items were developed and included in the standard questionnaire to test for upward and downward mobility tendencies of the New Careerists. Between 80-90% of the total group indicated upwardly mobile aspirations. Between one and five per cent indicated downwardly mobile aspirations. There is some question as to whether the items used really indicate anything other than a very specific response to a given statement, such as "Now that I am a member of this program, I feel like I want to go back to what I was doing before I entered the program."

On this item only a total of three agree with the statement and thus indicate downwardly mobile aspirations. Upward mobility is defined in terms of wanting to get a college education and get a "better job" -- one with more status, but not necessarily a larger salary. Consequently it seems that it may be difficult to measure what the real aspirations of this group are in terms of six items on a questionnaire. Also the research team may be defining mobility in different than many people in New Careers would define it.

However, on one statement used in this scale there was a significant difference ($p < .10 > .05$) between the response of the drop-out group and stay-in group. This statement was "An aide could pretty well learn all the skills of the professional (teacher, social worker, etc.) while working on the job." This statement was used to help indicate upward mobility occupationally. Seventy-two per cent of the drop-out group indicated upward mobility on this item while only 59% of the stay-in group indicated upward mobility on this item. When broken down into sub-groups on this item, 72% of the women drop-outs indicated upward mobility on this item while only 54% of the women stay-ins indicated upward mobility ($p < .05 > .02$). In the sub-group of people with a previous job in Category Three there was also a significant difference ($p < .10 > .05$) between drop-outs and stay-ins where 78% of the drop-outs indicated upward mobility while only 51% of the stay-ins indicated upward mobility. In the sub-grouping of non-whites there was also a significant difference ($p < .10 > .05$) between drop-outs and stay-ins where 82% of the non-white drop-outs indicated upward mobility while only 63% of the stay-ins indicated upward mobility. This seems to indi-

cate that women with previous jobs in Category Three are less inclined to have upwardly mobile aspirations occupationally and may believe they are less capable than the professionals. In any case on this item a higher percentage of drop-outs than stay-ins indicate upward mobility.

Upon reflection, however, this item may not represent mobility. It may be that the drop-outs are reacting negatively to the professional position. Thus their response may be indicating a rejection of a program to develop paraprofessionals.

Job Activities of Aides After Leaving New Careers

To supplement this information on mobility concerning the drop-out group, attempts were made to personally interview all the people who left the program before November, 1968. Interviewers talked with people about their plans after leaving New Careers. However this only helped to find out more about the mobility of people leaving the New Careers Program; and one cannot conclude anything about differences between drop-outs and stay-ins from this data.

There was information on 53 people who left the program as to what they were doing immediately or in most cases two to four months after they left New Careers. This information was obtained from personal interviews with the drop-outs or from the Central Office for Minneapolis New Careers.

Thirty-eight of the drop-outs in this group moved downward or back to what they were doing before they entered New Careers. The activities of this sub-group breaks down as follows:

1) Fourteen unemployed -- some of the women in this group started getting a full grant from AFDC again and were not looking for a job when

interviewed. Others in this group, especially the men, were looking for work, but were having a difficult time finding something because of a prison record or lack of training in specific areas or for other reasons. For example one aide who left the program is a government certified welder and belongs to the Union, but he has a felony conviction on his record and thus has a difficult time finding employment. Another aide quit a job he had for over five years to join New Careers. He left New Careers and was unemployed for a long period fater leaving the program. There is some indication here that New Careers was unable to meet the needs of these people. They indicated that they would have stayed with the program if things had worked out.

There is also a group of 51 drop-outs where there is no specific information on what they did after leaving New Careers. Some of the people in this group just disappeared and probably were unemployed for several months after leaving the program. Consequently the actual number of drop-outs who were out of work for a long period of time after leaving New Careers may be much higher than 21, but there is no way of verifying this.

2) Seven drop-outs in penal institutions -- Between three and four of these drop-outs were recent parolees who were only in the program a short time before being sent back to prison on parole violations.

3) Five aides were able to get their old jobs back when New Careers did not work out for them. In most cases this meant going back to a factory or other dead-end job.

4) Four aides left New Careers and found factory, construction, or other semi-skilled work in order to get more money or do something they were more interested in.

5) Eight aides left New Careers and transferred to Title I aides in the schools. All of these people were women with families to help support. In most cases going to school and working meant an over-loaded work schedule for them, and they felt they could only work part-time. Because they are not getting more education while on the job this position may be more of a low-level dead-end job for them than being a New Careers Aide is.

Fifteen aides out of the fifty-three in this group of drop-outs moved up occupationally or educationally when they left New Careers. Going back to college full-time or going to work on the regular staff of an agency is considered to be upward mobility in this case.

1) Seven aides left the program and moved up occupationally. For example, one aide went into business for herself; another became a journeyman electrician; and three aides joined the regular staff at their agencies (Police Dept., TCOIC, and School--substitute teacher).

2) Five aides left the program to go to school full-time. In all cases this was at the college level, and people attended school with scholarships or other types of financial assistance in order to work toward a four-year degree.

This information shows that the actual upward mobility among the drop-outs is less than what they indicate they aspire to when responding to the mobility items in the questionnaire.

Self-Concept Scale

This scale relates to the qualities a person attributes to himself in a particular role. On this scale New Careerists were asked to rank themselves on a scale of one to seven (1 = least, 7 = most, and

4 = average) on the following adjectives: Intelligent, Self-Confident, Selfish, Mature, Physically Attractive, Leadership, Friendly, Aggressive, Honest, Cooperative, Talkative, and Foolish. The mean scores for the drop-out group and the stay-in group were examined for each adjective to see if there was a significant difference between the two groups.

On the self-concept scale the total group ranks themselves lowest on the adjectives of selfish and foolish--both being characteristics which have negative connotations. On the average the total group ranks themselves above average on the other ten items on the scale. The most significant differences between the drop-out and stay-in groups exist between the group of women stay-ins and drop-outs. There is a significant difference between these two sub-groups on eight items in the scale. None of the other sub-groupings indicate any kind of significant trend. Three of the adjectives in the scale are not discussed here, because there is no significant difference between any of the stay-in and drop-out sub-groups. These adjectives are friendly, aggressive, and physically attractive. The total group ranks themselves above 4.5 on these three adjectives (Table XI).

When the total drop-out and stay-in groups are compared there is a significant difference between the two groups on three out of the twelve adjectives. These include the adjectives of leadership ($p < .025 > .01$) cooperative ($p < .10 > .05$), and talkative ($p < .01 > .005$).

"Leadership" -- The 152 stay-ins who responded to this item on the average rank themselves higher than the 73 drop-outs who reponded on this item.

"Cooperative" -- The stay-in group also sees themselves as more

TABLE XI: MEAN SCORES ON SELF CONCEPT SCALE

Items in Self-Concept Scale Broken Down By:	Stay-in Mean Score	Drop-out Mean Score	p[1]
Total Group:			
Leadership	x = 5.1	x = 4.6	p <.025 >.01
Cooperative	x = 6.1	x = 5.8	p <.10 >.05
Talkative	x = 4.9	x = 4.4	p <.01 >.005
Men:			
Mature	x = 5.32	x = 6.0	p <.01 >.005
Talkative	x = 4.8	x = 4.3	p <.10 >.05
Foolish	x = 3.9	x = 3.1	p <.05 >.02
Women:			
Self-Confident	x = 4.8	x = 4.4	p <.10 >.05
Selfish	x = 3.0	x = 3.9	p <.05 >.02
Mature	x = 5.5	x = 4.8	p <.005 >.001
Leadership	x = 5.1	x = 4.3	p <.01 >.005
Honest	x = 6.1	x = 5.7	p <.10 >.05
Cooperative	x = 6.2	x = 5.7	p <.01 >.005
Talkative	x = 5.0	x = 4.5	p <.05 >.025
Foolish	x = 3.8	x = 4.8	p <.05 >.025
Occupation-Category 2:			
Intelligent	x = 4.6	x = 5.0	p <.10 >.05
Occupation-Category 3:			
Leadership	x = 5.1	x = 4.6	p <.10 >.05
Talkative	x = 5.2	x = 4.2	p <.025 >.01
Foolish	x = 3.0	x = 4.5	p <.025 >.01
Non-Whites:			
Leadership	x = 5.1	x = 4.4	p <.025 >.010
Talkative	x = 5.0	x = 4.1	p <.025 >.010
Whites:			
Self-Confident	x = 4.7	x = 4.2	p <.10 >.05
Honest	x = 5.9	x = 5.4	p <.10 >.05

[1]Entries here represent the probability that the corresponding difference could have occurred by chance.

cooperative than the drop-out group.

"Talkative" -- The stay-in group on the average also sees themselves as more talkative than the drop-out group.

When the two groups are divided up according to sex, there is a significant difference between the two groups of men on the adjectives of mature, talkative and foolish; and there is a significant difference between the two groups of women on the adjectives of self-confident, selfish, mature, leadership, honest, cooperative, talkative, and foolish.

For the group of men drop-outs and stay-ins, there is a significant difference between the two sub-groups on three adjectives. A group of 32 male drop-outs sees themselves as more mature than the group of 50 males who stayed in the program. People in these sub-groupings who remained in the program see themselves as more talkative than the group of men who left the program. However the men who left the program see themselves as <u>less</u> foolish than the men who remained in the program. It is difficult to reach any sharp conclusions about the difference in the self-concepts of these two sub-groups.

On the other hand there is a greater difference on these scales between the women drop-outs and stay-ins than between any other sub-grouping. The women drop-outs and stay-ins differ significantly on eight out of twelve adjectives. On the two negative adjectives--selfish and foolish--the group of 100 women remaining in the program sees themselves as less selfish and foolish than the group of 41 women who left the program. On all the other six adjectives where there is a significant difference the women remaining in the program rank themselves higher than the women who left the program.

It appears that the women who remain in the program are possibly more sure of themselves even though they may not be as aggressive in becoming professionals. This group may just be more interested in having a steady job where they can still spend time with their families. Also the women who remain in the program are significantly older on the average ($x = 37.2$) than women who leave the program ($x = 32.8$).

Occupation: When the total group is divided up according to previous occupation, there is a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins on four adjectives. People who left New Careers and had previous jobs in Category Two see themselves as significantly more intelligent than the group that remained with the program.

The sub-group with previous jobs in Category Three--24 drop-outs and 44 stay-ins on this scale--differed significantly on three adjectives of the self-concept scale. The group remaining in the program with previous jobs in Category Three ranked themselves significantly higher on leadership than the drop-out group did. Stay-ins in this sub-group also ranked themselves significantly higher on talkative than the drop-outs. However the stay-ins saw themselves as significantly less foolish than the drop-outs saw themselves.

Race: When the drop-out and stay-in groups are divided according to race there is a significant difference on four adjectives.

For the non-white sub-group, there is a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins on leadership and the adjective of talkative. The 39 people in the drop-out group rank themselves on the average lower on leadership than the 69 people in the stay-in group do. The drop-out group also sees themselves on the average as less talkative than the stay-in group.

For the white sub-group, there is a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins on self-confident and honest. The 18 people in the drop-out group see themselves on the average as less self-confident than the 52 people in the stay-in group. The drop-out group also sees themselves as less honest than the stay-in group does.

A correlational analysis was also conducted to determine if any of the self concept items provided a predictor of who would drop out of a new careers program. The results of this analysis showed that not more than 3% of the variation in terms of whether a person dropped out or stayed in the program could be accounted for by knowing the enrollee's score on the self concept inventory items.

Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale is a scale developed to help identify negative self-esteem; the lower the score, the lower the respondent's self-esteem. High or average self-esteem cannot be measured on this scale. Respondents are asked whether they agree or disagree with a given item. On all the items, a response of 1 is taken to indicate low self-esteem; a response of 2 is not interpretable. The only item on this scale where there was a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins in any of the sub-groupings was on the following: "I am able to do things as well as most other people." When drop-outs and stay-ins are compared on this item there is a significant difference ($p < .10 > .05$) in the frequency distribution. Thirteen per cent of the stay-ins indicate low self-esteem while only 4% in the group of 70 drop-outs indicate low self-esteem. In a group of 100 women stay-ins 16% indicate low self-esteem while only 4% of the 39 women drop-outs indicate low self-esteem.

This is a significant difference between these two sub-groups ($p < .20 > .10$). There is also a significant difference ($p < .20 > .10$) between the drop- outs and stay-ins with previous occupations in Category Two. Fourteen per cent out of 56 stay-ins indicate low self-esteem on the item while 0% of the drop-outs in this sub-group indicate low self-esteem. For the item--"I am able to do things as well as most other people"--a higher percentage of people remaining in the program indicate low self-esteem. However except for one other item this is the only place on the whole scale of nine items where there is a significant difference between drop-outs and stay-ins.

CHAPTER V

WHY DO NEW CAREERISTS LEAVE THE PROGRAM IN MINNEAPOLIS BEFORE COMPLETING TWO YEARS?

Summary: The way in which agencies and the Central Administration tried to meet the needs of New Careerists during their first several months on the job was a key issue in whether people left the program within the first year.

Aides may have asked to work in a specific agency, and then they were assigned to a different agency where they did not like the job situation. For example, if a person felt he or she could not work with children and was assigned to a school, this could cause problems for the aide. Consequently the agencies and the Central Administration should be concerned during an aide's first months on the job with a broad spectrum of needs. These needs include such things as special needs of mothers concerning child-care, special needs of people just coming out of prison, and job development to meet the needs of people in New Careers and not just giving people menial work. Many people left the program when these needs were not met. People did not like their work in an agency and were unable to get a transfer.

People coming into New Careers must be given a clear outline of what to expect from New Careers--in their jobs and in the education component. When this was not the case, some aides felt they were given false hopes about "moving up" and left the program. People who remain in the program probably make certain adjustments to the limitations of the program and may come to accept the kind of work they have to do.

The research report written on job interests under this same project helps substantiate this conclusion.[2]

Many of the reasons drop-outs gave for leaving the program were areas of concern where some changes could have been made by participating agencies and the Central Administration.

Interviews with People Who Left New Careers

To find out some of these reasons concerning why people left the New Careers Program in Minneapolis before completing two years of work and training, the research team attempted to interview as many people as possible who left the program between September, 1967, and October, 1968. These interviews and information from the Central Office for New Careers were the main sources of information used to find out why people left the New Careers Program.

Forty-five out of 104 drop-outs were actually interviewed. A limited amount of information is available on 53 of the drop-outs either from the Central Office, or members of their families. For two of the drop-outs no contact was made and no information was available at the Central Office; and two others would not talk to the interviewer.

The major reasons why people left New Careers are divided into three areas: 1) problems of recruitment and placement, 2) needs of the aides not being met in such areas as kind of work and education, and 3) personal reasons (including moving, jail, or death). (See Table XII.) Some people left the program for a number of reasons which fit into more

---

[2]Thompson and Falk.

TABLE XII: REASONS WHY ENROLLEES LEFT NEW CAREERS AS WAS STATED IN INTERVIEWS WITH THEM

Type of Reason for Leaving New Careers:	No. of times this occurred as a reason
I. Problems of Recruitment & Placement	
1. Recruitment and Placement	9
2. New Welfare Law	3
II. Needs of Aides not Being Met in Work or Education Situation	
1. Did not like the kind of work assigned	14
2. Low rate of pay	4
3. Not satisfied with education component	4
III. Personal Reasons	
1. Getting a different job	5
2. Family problems	4
3. Babysitting problems	5
4. Over-burdened	7
5. Health	6
6. In jail or other problems with law	13
7. Fired or released from program	3
8. Moved, left town or whereabouts unknown	30
9. Deceased	3

than one category; thus the total number of people placed in all the categories may be greater than the total number of drop-outs in the sample.

Problems of Recruitment and Placement

Nine out of 45 drop-outs interviewed listed one of their reasons for leaving the program to be things concerning their recruitment into the program and placement in the agency.

For example, Aide A never really got started in the program. She was supposed to work at the grade school which her children attended. But she was transferred to a junior high 20 blocks from her home, and

when she asked the agency and the Central Office to be transferred back to the grade school, it did not come through. Aide A said that in order to work at the junior high she had to leave home at 7:15 a.m. which was earlier than when her children had to leave. She could not arrange for a babysitter at this time in the morning. Consequently she left the program and went to work two hours a day as an aide at the grade school her children attend.

Aide B never actually got started in the program. She was assigned to the schools, but told them she did not want to work as a teachers aide. She was then transferred to an employment and training agency. After several attempts to set up an appointment with someone at the agency--where she was told to talk to several different people--she gave up on starting work in the New Careers Program.

Another aide had a similar experience when he was assigned to an agency by the Central Office. Aide C kept going to the agency to find out when he could start work. He was given the run-around for over a month and never assigned to a job as an instructor's aide in the welding class which was the position the agency said he would get. He was never contacted by the Central Office or the agency until he finally got a letter saying he was dropped from the program. Although he is a skilled laborer he was unable to get another job because of a past prison record.

Another aide had to leave the program after she was recruited into the program, certified and one the job; because she was not 22 years old yet.

All the other aides in this group gave similar reasons for leaving the program. People were assigned to agencies without much regard to

their feelings at times, and when they requested a transfer early in the program or even before starting work at a given agency, they were denied this. At times there was a breakdown in communication between the Central Administration of New Careers and the agencies. The aide was often the one caught in the middle and, in the end, out of a probably much needed job. There is a need consequently to tighten up the administrative lines of communication in order to benefit new enrollees and see that they are placed in a job they want.

Another problem that occurred in connection with the Central Administration (although more closely tied with powers in Washington, D.C. than with the powers in Minneapolis) was that a new welfare law appeared one year after the program started. In Minnesota people working in an OEO program were entitled to an earnings exemption before September, 1968. In September, 1968, this was no longer in effect, and this forced some mothers to leave theprogram or owrk at a rate of pay that was not large enough to support their families. Only 3 women gave this as the main reason for leaving the program, but there may have been more. This was not a thing enrollees had control over nor was it something the Central Office in Minneapolis could do much about. It was just another irony of the powers playing with the lives and livelihood of little people without thinking about the short-sightedness of their legislation and the programs that come out of such legislation.

One aide who left the program for this reason told an interviewer: "The whole thing was a lot of bolony because they start something and then you are cut off so why whould people try to go out and do things if they are going to get put down for it."

Needs of the Aides Not Being Met By the Program

Twenty-three aides did not like their specific job, were not satisfied with the educational component, or were not getting enough pay; and consequently these people left the program.

For example, Aide D left the program after she tried unsuccessfully to get a transfer to another agency. She did not like her job for a number of reasons. She said that there were too many meetings to go to that were not job-related, and not on job time, but if you did not go, you would get docked in pay. She said a lot of these meetings were scheduled for 4:00 and 5:00 in the evening, and she could not afford a babysitter all the time. Another thing she did not like about her job was that there was never any work to do. She was a TA in a typing class, and there were no students in the class half the time and she sat around with nothing to do. She felt the whole situation at the agency was very poorly organized and everything was confusing.

Aide E also quit because she did not like her job and was unable to get a transfer through the Central Office. She quit over a conflict of duties. She was hired as a Counselors Aide in the schools. She worked instead as an Aide to the Nurse. She said she did not feel capable in this job, and that whoever did it should at least have a first aid course. She explained that the nurse was only there every other day, and on the nurse's days off she had to handle the children alone. She felt that many of the cases that came to her attention needed doctor's care. The school agreed to the idea of her transferring, but it could not be worked out with the Central Office so she left the program.

Aide F left his job at one of the Corrections agencies after three months because he did not like the work.

Several aides who left the schools did not like the kind of housekeeping duties they were assigned to do by the teachers. For example, Aide G stated in an interview that the only time she got to work in the classroom was while the teachers went on their breaks, and then she was asked to watch two and sometimes three classes at once. She was assigned to work for several different teachers who only had her do things like water plants, wash blackboards, empty waste baskets, and do other menial work.

Fourteen aides listed not liking the kind of work they had to do in the agency as their main reason for leaving the program. It seems that in most cases the agencies were not offering them anything very challenging or valuable to do and unless they adjusted to doing menial tasks they would continue to be dissatisfied with their jobs.

Four people listed the low rate of pay as their main reason for leaving the program. These were all men who had families to support, and $2.00 to $2.24 an hour was just not enough. Only one out of the four was unemployed for any length after leaving the program, and the others got higher paying jobs. This seems to indicate that if New Careers is to continue and is interested in getting unemployed or under-employed men into the program, they must begin looking at the wage scale.

Four aides listed the education component as their main reason for leaving the program. However all these people had different concerns and many of them tied with the kind of information people may not be given when they are recruited into the program.

For example Aide G left his job at a corrections agency because he could not get training in electronics. He stated in an interview:

"When I found out I couldn't get technical training I decided it was best for them and me to leave the program. I was working with electronics stuff everyday on the job so I thought I should be able to get some training in it."

Aide H was a college graduate from another state, and only needed certain courses to become a certified teacher which she could not get under the educational component of New Careers at the University. Consequently she left the program to substitute teach and work on getting a teacher's certificate.

Aide I also had had some college and was just dissatisfied with the courses she could choose from through the New Careers Program.

Another aide felt that school could not teach any of the things he wanted to learn, and that he could learn them better outside the structure of the schools.

There was no one thing that people disliked in the education component. So from talking with people who left the program it is difficult to suggest any ways that the education component might be changed unless it was broadened to meet the needs of a more diverse group of people--i.e., to include technical as well as academic training.

Personal Factors for Leaving the Program

The various reasons for leaving included in this category are the following: 1) getting a different job; 2) family problems; 3) baby-sitting problems; 4) over-burdened with school, work and family--"too much"; 5) health problems; 6) problems with the law or in jail; 7) fired or released from the program; 8) moved, left town, or whereabouts unknown; and 9) deceased.

1) Getting a different job -- Five people left the program when they got different jobs. Although many people who left the program got other jobs, they were unemployed for a period of time after leaving the program and finding a different job was not their main reason for leaving.

In these five cases people moved directly into another job they had wanted when they entered New Careers. For example Aide J received a load she applied for before entering New Careers and was able to open a restaurant. Two aides joined the regular staff of the agencies they were aides at--one became a policeman after passing all the Civil Service examinations and the other became a counselor at TCOIC. The fourth aide in this group got a job in the skilled trades, and consequently left the program, and a fifth aide went to work in organizing his own community.

2) Family problems -- Four aides listed family problems as the main reason for leaving the program. In most cases these people did not elaborate on this except that the amount of time they had to spend away from home seemed to help complicate problems in their families, and they subsequently left the program.

3) Babysitting Problems -- Five women listed getting reliable babysitting service as their main reason for leaving the program. Other people who had family problems and felt over-burdened may have also had trouble getting someone to watch their children while they were at work or school. This is one problem that the community could help solve by having adequate day-care centers available for working parents.

4) Over-burdened with school, work and family -- "too much" -- Seven women who left the program felt that trying to go to school, work

20 hours a week in an agency, and care for their family was overburdening. For some of these women the strain and stress of all this caused health problems, and they were forced to leave the program from illness. One woman explained to an interviewer that she liked both her job and school, but the strain was too much and she felt she was neglecting her seven children. This woman did not look for another job after leaving the program, but she was interested in continuing to go to school if she could get financial help.

5) Health Problems -- Six people left New Careers because of illness. In most cases these people spent time in a hospital and found it too hard to catch up with their job and studies, besides reassuming their family responsibilities and thus left the program.

6) Problems with the law or in jail -- Eight aides were jailed while in the program and consequently were dropped from New Careers. Five other recent parolees were dropped from New Careers when they disappeared, and in most cases were wanted by the police. (Total = 13.)

7) Released from New Careers by the Central Office -- Three people explained to interviewers that they were released by the Central Office for excessive absenteeism or other reasons. In many cases people who failed to show up on the job for a long period of time were dropped from the program. However the research team was unable to contact many of these people, and consequently there is no information about why these people just stopped coming to work at the agencies.

8) Moved, left town, or whereabouts unknown -- This is the large group of people who left New Careers and were not interviewed by the research team. The only information available about them is that they moved to another location in Minneapolis, or left town for personal

reasons. Thirteen people had moved before or after they left the program, and no personal contact was made with them by the research team after they left the program. Ten other people left town for personal reasons and were not interviewed by the research team. Seven other people who left the program may have left town or just moved to another address in Minneapolis, but this information could not be obtained in any way. (Total = 30.)

9) Deceased -- Three people died while in New Careers.

None of the people who left the program, listed in items 6, 8, or 9, were interviewed by the research team before or after they left the program. Consequently for almost 50% of the drop-outs there is no information about their feelings on the program unless they filled out one of the standard questionnaires.

Work Adjustment Project Data on Drop-Outs

In Job Interests and Job Satisfactions of New Careerists, a New Careers Research report, a careful look was taken at the drop-out and stay-in groups in an effort to determine what it is that makes some people drop out while others stay in. This information was taken from the MIQ which is used to help identify the work interests or needs of the people given the questionnaire.

According to the report on job interests, the MIQ shows that "drop-outs have their highest vocational needs in the areas of achievement, ability utilization and advancement. Their lowest vocational interests are in social status and independence. From a comparison of these interests with those of the total group, it is clear that the drop-outs have a more even level of job needs with fewer extremes; further, they

have lower needs for social service and higher needs for authority and variety.

"Stay-ins need an opportunity to give social service in their jobs considerably more than do the drop-outs while the drop-outs can be seen to have a higher need in the supervision-human relations area. Stay-ins have a higher need for achievement and independence while drop-outs have a higher level of need in the areas of recognition and technical supervision."[3]

Further analysis of the work needs indicated that not more than 3% of the variation in terms of whether a person dropped out or stayed in the program could be accounted for by knowing the enrollee's score on the MIQ. In short, work needs do not predict who will drop out of the program.

ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE DROP-OUT GROUP WHILE THEY ARE IN THE PROGRAM?

Only sixteen people in the drop-out group took both the first and second standard questionnaire. This small sub-group was compared to look for significant differences on the self-concept scale. Although the means on the scale items differed between Time One and Time Two for most of the sixteen subjects, there was not a significant difference between the means. On ten of the items on the self-concept the mean scores went up on the second questionnaire. However the changes are not great enough to substantiate whether it was by chance or not.

Consequently the data available from this study shows no significant changes in the drop-out group while they are in the program.

---

[3]Thompson and Falk.

2

A.2000 6648

6/69

UP THE UP STAIRCASE: IMPRESSIONS OF THE NEW CAREERIST AS STUDENT*

For the most part institutions of higher learning have been eager to become involved in community programs, have developed active recruiting programs for the poor and for members of minority groups, but have not always anticipated the many institutional changes required. The institutions, for example, have not always been prepared to provide specific curriculum and counseling modifications. More generally, the infusion of unique student populations, with exceptional vitality and a life style that emphasizes the "nowness" of social problems, has caught us by suprise. The unexpected political and social changes demanded of the institution have given us the opportunity to reexamine the nature of the institution's response to all student populations. It is our hope that the following impressions of the New Careerist as student will help to prepare other institutions for the inevitable "culture shock" that arises from efforts to incorporate culturally different students into a traditional college population.

In analyzing the experience of the New Careerists on campus, it is essential to keep in mind that we are not looking at students who come out of middle-class backgrounds, fresh from high school, well prepared to move ahead to a degree in higher education. On the contrary, we have students who come, by and large, with a long history of tension and conflict arising out of the frustrations in their crisis-laden lives. Poverty, racism, illness, personal deficiencies - all the wrong circumstances - have conspired in one way or another to keep them out of the opportunity structure. Each one carries a special bitter knowledge of his own life experience. Each one has endured, for the most part, the grim struggle for survival. The University of Minnesota New Careers Program numbers among its enrollees a large proportion of mothers supported by AFDC who are often heads of large households, men who have exhibited constant underemployment, and about 20% ex-offenders. By and large, the population comes from the so-called "hard core", represents Negroes, Indians and Caucasians, and averages approximately 35 years of age. The worldly knowledge of such students outstrips anything that the conventional student brings with him into the classroom. Much of this knowledge is reflected in the way in which the low-income person assumes the role of student. Because it has important implications for the educational component designed for them, we shall briefly touch on some characteristics of the "life style" of the New Careerist as it affects his role as student.

---

* The Minneapolis New Careers program funded through the OEO by the Dept. of Labor is a work-study opportunity for unemployed and under-employed adults. The enrollees spend half of their work day employed as paraprofessionals in preparation for careers in the human services (e.g., education, social service, corrections). During the remaining portion of their work day New Careerists participate in educational pursuits primarily as students in the General College, a junior college on the campus of the University of Minnesota. Additional information about the program may be obtained by writing to the Office of New Careers, 219 Clay School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

One precaution is necessary here: it is misleading to speak in any general terms about New Careerists as a "class." Indeed, failure to recognize interclass differences among New Careerists, or low-income persons in general may lead one into the kind of rigidities in program development that could be fatally defective. In part, the confusion in understanding the heterogeneity among the poor arises out of mistaking economic position for life style. Although all New Careerists in the Minneapolis program by virtue of eligibility guidelines must be economically disadvantaged, lack of income is perhaps their only unifying feature. One detects at least two major groups. One is essentially middle class in origin, but, through a series of misfortunes, is no longer self-sufficient. On the whole this group attaches a high value to liberal education, work, and values of the conventional community. Another group, born and reared in poverty, attaches little importance to education that is not utilitarian, places less value on work as a way of life, and tends to adhere to values that arise out of narrow personal and neighborhood experiences. Out of repeated failures, this group displays a notable lack of confidence in the capacity to be "competent" in the traditional sense of that word.

The challenge to an educational program that is lodged in a junior college or university lies in the institution's capacity to respond to the spectrum of life styles that a constituency such as this presents. The following observations drawn from the Minneapolis New Careers program may throw light on some of the situations that require adaptation on the part of the conventional higher educational system. (These comments will relate chiefly to the second group mentioned above. The first group more or less meets the usual expectations as students.)

First, one must take into account that, out of a sense of low self-esteem and an experience of exclusion, academic tests generate in New Careerists, as well as other students enrolled in special community programs, a degree of fear and anxiety that is well beyond that experienced by most college students. Out of this consideration, we held formal testing to a bare minimum in the first quarter; instead of testing, we used the academic experience itself as an evaluation of the enrollee's strengths and weaknesses. Formal testing was delayed and introduced only in the second and third quarters. While it still induces great anxiety, New Careers students are better able to tolerate tests once they feel more settled into the role of student. Multiple-choice questionnaires still present difficulty. The verbal "games" which make up a large part of multiple-choice examinations create a good deal of hostility in the New Careerist; he will often complain about ambiguities and demand "straighter" questions. (We are still not certain that he differs very much from the regular student in this respect.) Written essay examinations also present problems; many instructors have arranged take-home examinations to deal with the unusual degree of anxiety induced by the prospect of written tests. The use of tape recorders for oral examinations has been mentioned as another possibility, although, to our knowledge, no instructor has actually used this alternative. Another troubling aspect of the testing or questionnaires situation concerns "personal" inquiries. Formal testing procedures and personal questionnaires which require responses about past background tend to arouse the anger and suspicion of many enrollees. Questions relating to "father's education level" and marital status are particularly objectionable. It will, perhaps, be the low-income student who will eventually force

a long overdue review of irrelevancies in testing and questionnaires procedures.

The New Careerist as student vis-a-vis the scholar as instructor also gives rise to certain problems. There is a gulf of distrust between the New Careerist, who regards himself as having extensive knowledge of the human condition derived from personal experience, and the instructor, who is regarded as the scholar deriving his knowledge from the sheltered grove of the academy. In a sense, the classroom becomes somewhat of a battleground, pitting the student hardened by life's experiences against the instructor considered as armed only with theoretical knowledge (e.g., the ex-offender in a criminology class or the mother of 8 children in a "Family Patterns" class). The task of the instructor is to acknowledge the validity of the enrollee's personal experiences but, in addition, to dilate the range of the student's perspective and to help him learn how to conceptualize, to organize, and to criticize. The selection of instructors who know how to fuse the New Careerist's personal knowledge with that of the scholar's broad view becomes critical in the successful teaching of the New Careers curriculum. One New Careers instructor described his task as an effort to expand "provincial" views to "metropolitan" views.

Related to the problem of instruction is the New Careerist's view of curriculum. Material which is not immediately familiar to his range of personal knowledge is sometimes considered uncongenial and irrelevant. There is, of course, much that is drudgery in the conventional educational process. For the New Careerist this drudgery is especially burdensome, considering the other responsibilities that he carries. Couple these observations with the enrollee's perception that course work should be wholly utilitarian and specifically job-related and one glimpses the controversial aspects of designing New Careers curricula.

In many ways the enrollees' discussions of curricula mirror the turbulence that is generated by regular students in their probing questions about the relevance of content, the quality of teaching, and the appropriate mix of academic abstractions with the realities of contemporary crises. Despite apparent weaknesses in curriculum and instruction, however, only a modest number of New Careerists have resisted the idea of a liberal education. For most of the New Careerists, the broad range of course work available to them has been a source of self-renewal. For example, during 1967-68, the first year of the program, New Careerists enrolled in a total of 58 different courses, in the General College, in the College of Liberal Arts, and in the General Extension Division. Table I cites the distribution of courses taken:

TABLE I

Course Area		Number of Different Courses Undertaken
Science		6
Mathematics		3
Social Studies		17
Includes:	Sociology	
	Psychology	
	History	
	Political Science	
	Economics	

Course Area		Number of Different Courses Undertaken
Communication skills		11
Humanities		16
Includes:	Philosophy	
	Commercial Art	
	Art	
	Music	
Business		5
	Total	58

A preliminary analysis of grades which New Careerists earned during the first year of the program indicates that they did at least as well, if not better, than other General College students in the expected grade distributions normally assigned to classes. Among enrollees in General College, 10 made the Dean's List. A total of 429 grades were given for the 58 courses taken. Table 2 shows the actual grade distribution as well as the expected grade distribution.

TABLE 2

Grade	Frequency	Expected Frequency
A	68	43
B	106	86
C	190	171
D	43	86
F	22	43

While the course and grade distributions are quite encouraging, one aspect of the educational accomplishments raises some question. About 20% of the courses attempted by New Careerists are not completed and consequently earn a grade of I (Incomplete). This figure is twice as high as incompletes earned by regular General College students. Two problems become immediately evident. First, in their efforts to collect a many academic credits as possible in as short a time as possible, these half time students frequently attempt more than they can handle. Along with their work and family responsibilities, many New Careerists lack the "work habits" or "compulsiveness" required to succeed in the educational ritual. Consequently, the nature of the academic culture confronts the student with a state of crisis with which he cannot cope. He becomes discouraged and stops attending some of his classes.

Another source of conflict is the occasional "lack of faith" demonstrated by faculty. Rosenthal and Jacobson* hypothesize that the student "does poorly in school because that is what is expected of him. In other words, his shortcomings may originate not in his different ethnic culture and economic background but in his teachers' response to that background."

---

* Robert Rosenthal and Lenore F. Jacobson, "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged", Scientific American, April 1968, Vol. 218, No. 4.

Several students commented that teachers didn't believe that they could perform, and "we had to prove ourselves over and over again." We have conducted many orientation sessions consisting of faculty discussions of grading conflicts, student behavior, and student-teacher relationships. Out of these sessions came our impression that many faculty do display latent prejudice, and that this is not necessarily a mis-conceived perception of students.

While registration and classroom rituals lead to conflict, ancillary services, too, provide "culture shock" for students and institutional personnel alike. For example, in spite of an orientation for bookstore personnel, we found students frequently impatient with the red tape of acquiring books and supplies through special scholarship arrangements, while bookstore personnel frequently exhibited hostility to students who were able to buy books at no cost to themselves.

Clerks, secretaries, health service personnel, etc., frequently are jarred by what appears to be personal abrasiveness exhibited by students. In turn, the enrollees interpret staff behavior as racist and degrading. What began as culture shock leads quickly to potentially explosive situations.

Still another aspect of the New Careerist as student has engaged the attention of the staff. This is the question of the effects of higher education on the New Careerist's so-called "life style" - a life style sometimes described as "indigenous". Whether the enrollee can retain his natural style of manner, language, and presence, which link him closely to his own constituency, or whether he will become "professionalized" as he moves through higher education caused a great deal of speculation in developing programs for paraprofessionals drawn from the low-income community. At this time, research data in the Minneapolis program shows that "professionalization" actually does not "contaminate" the enrollee.* Indeed, what does occur is a process where enrollees learn new language patterns as well as other new behavior patterns. They add to their existing large repertoire of role "skills." In other words, the enrollees are simply increasing the number of different roles they are able to play. There is no reason to believe that they unlearn any of their old patterns. They know how to make the "switch" and make it work for them.

One of the underlying goals of the New Careers Program educational component is to assure the enrollees of their adequacies and to reflect back to them the value of their own human resources. It is in this context that an unexpected development has taken place. Both the staff and the instructors have been able to identify many of the enrollees as having particular talents which can be useful to the community. We note with interest that during the past year several enrollees have taken community positions on task forces, committees, and boards. A few have accepted special assignments from the Minneapolis School Board. Many have assumed

---

* Margaret A. Thompson, "The Professionalization of New Careerists", unpublished Master's Thesis, Univ. of Minn., August, 1969 and Margaret A. Thompson, "Contamination of New Careerists by Professionalization: Fact or Fancy?", Univ. of Minn. New Careers Research, General College and Minnesota Center for Sociological Research, May 1969.

positions of leadership in their neighborhood organizations.

The University of Minnesota has found a way to make use of the very special talents and knowledge which the ghetto resident brings with him to the traditional institution. A number of New Careerists have been engaged as teaching assistants and Cultural Education Specialists. Their functions include helping the teacher to prepare syllabi relevant to current social problems, and to interpret the cultural style of the ghetto resident to the traditional student. For example, ex-offenders are now participating in criminology classes to supplement with their first hand knowledge the theory provided by the professor. Similarly, education courses dealing with the role of the school and the community make use of the Cultural Specialists to state the perception which minority and poor persons have of the educational systems. The fact that the Cultural Specialists are available to augment existing educational opportunities, and that they at the same time get paid for their special services, creates a situation beneficial to both the institution and the indigent student, and the traditional student.

While no stereotype of the New Careers student will suffice, we are on the whole considering a population that has been out of school for many years and that in general has had unsuccessful school experiences. Predictably, there was among beginning New Careers students uncertainty, anxiety, and a feeling of intimidation at the prospect of the University and its academic routines; there is now, however, general agreement among the staff and instructors that we had underestimated the adaptability of New Careers students. They rapidly learned to cope with the credit system and with University procedures; they quickly assumed the role of student in mastering the skills necessary to deal with assigned readings, with written requirements, and with technical language. From data gathered by the New Careers research staff, from extensive informal conversations with many of the New Careerists themselves, from instructors and agency personnel, the unanimous conclusion is that the opportunity for an education afforded by the New Careers program is of inestimable value.

"Without an education, I will never by anything but a flunky," was a sentiment echoed over and over again by the enrollees. An overwhelming number of New Careerists spoke of the program and its educational component as their last chance to win their way into "the system." We note that during the Fall Quarter, 1968, of those New Careerists who had been in the program two or more quarters, 113 elected to register for course work well over the recommended minimum of six credits (in addition to the two credits for on-the-job experience*). On the whole, there has been a strikingly low dropout rate attributed to academic frustration.

Glancing back over a year's experience we now see that, in a sense, we asked the beginning New Careerists, filled with many doubts and anxieties about their competencies, to surpass themselves. An overwhelming number did so.

---

* Two academic credits per quarter are awarded by Field Work Instructors who supervise the work experience and who conduct work related seminars.

The previous pages on the whole present a rather happy picture. It should be clear that the successes come about in the midst of constant turmoil and latent revolution. The successes depend on an active program of supportive services made up of a large and competent counseling staff, and understanding and willing tutoring staff and special remedial courses especially in writing and arithmetic skills.

Our own bias frequently causes us to be quite surprised to find that a large number of students, who have been deprived of educational opportunities, succeed extremely well in the academic setting. This same bias prevents us from dealing competently with the educationally hesitatnt who require special supportive services and who often reject these services when they are offered in the wrong way.

In sum, if junior colleges, community colleges, and universities are to provide a genuine and useful opportunity for low income people we must not only be prepared for the culture shock experienced by the students unfamiliar with our unique bureaucracies, but we must also be prepared for our own culture shock as teachers, counselors, and administrators who will be in daily contact with people whose life experiences have been significantly different from our own.